

Remarks/Arguments:

Reconsideration of the application is requested.

Claims 1-7 remain in the application.

In the second paragraph on page 3 of the Office action, claims 1, 2, and 6 have been rejected as being obvious over Baba (JP 58-164232 A) in view of Camus (EP 0 701 281 A2) under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

In the eighth paragraph on page 3 of the Office action, claims 1-4 and 6 have been rejected as being obvious over Schneegans et al. (U.S Patent No. 5,901,901) (hereinafter "Schneegans") in view of Camus (EP 0 701 281 A2) under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

As will be explained below, it is believed that the claims were patentable over the cited art in their original form and the claims have, therefore, not been amended to overcome the references.

The rejections over Baba and Schneegans will be discussed together.

Before discussing the prior art in detail, it is believed that a brief review of the invention as claimed, would be helpful.

Claim 1 calls for, *inter alia*:

a buffer layer configured on the metal area, the buffer layer being substantially composed of nickel and having a thickness between 5 μm and 10 μm .

It is a requirement for a *prima facie* case of obviousness, that the prior art references must teach or suggest all the claim limitations.

The references do not show or suggest a buffer layer configured on the metal area, the buffer layer being substantially composed of nickel and having a thickness between 5 μm and 10 μm , as recited in claim 1 of the instant application.

The references applied by the Examiner do not teach or suggest all the claim limitations. Therefore, it is believed that the Examiner has not produced a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

The following comments pertain to the Examiner's comments on page 2 of the Office action, that the specification contains

no disclosure of either the critical nature of the claimed ranges or any unexpected results arising therefrom.

It is respectfully noted that the Examiner is error. The Examiner is directed to page 4, lines 20-23 of the instant application, where it is stated that "it has been shown, surprisingly, that a buffer layer made of nickel and having a thickness between 5 μm and 10 μm greatly increases the stability of the connection between the carrier and the chip with respect to temperature fluctuations." As can be seen from the above-noted passage of the specification, the specification does contain disclosure of either the critical nature of the claimed ranges or any unexpected results arising therefrom.

Because the specification discloses unexpected results with regard to the buffer layer made of nickel having a thickness between 5 μm and 10 μm , the Examiner is requested to withdraw the rejection over Baba in view of Camus and the rejection over Schneegans in view of Camus.

In the seventh paragraph on page 4 of the Office action, claims 1, 2, 5, and 6 have been rejected as being obvious over Huang et al. (U.S Patent Application Publication 2002/0074672

A1) (hereinafter "Huang") in view of Camus (EP 0 701 281 A2) under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

It is noted that the Huang reference has a U.S. filing date of December 15, 2000. Enclosed herewith is a German language Invention Disclosures and an English language translation thereof. Declarations under 37 CFR 1.131 indicating that the present invention was reduced to practice at least as early as December 14, 2000, are also enclosed herewith. Based on the above-noted information, the Huang reference is not available as Prior art. Therefore, the rejection over Huang is moot.

In the seventh paragraph on page 6 of the Office action, claim 7 has been rejected as being obvious over Baba (JP 58-164232 A) in view of Camus (EP 0 701 281 A2) and further in view of Arakawa et al. (U.S Patent No. 4,497,875) (hereinafter "Arakawa") under 35 U.S.C. § 103. The Arakawa reference does not make up for the deficiencies of Baba and Camus. Since claim 1 is believed to be allowable, dependent claim 7 is believed to be allowable as well.

In the third paragraph on page 7 of the Office action, claim 7 has been rejected as being obvious over Schneegans (U.S Patent No. 5,901,901) in view of Camus (EP 0 701 281 A2) and further in view of Arakawa (U.S Patent No. 4,497,875) under 35 U.S.C.

§ 103. The Arakawa reference does not make up for the deficiencies of Schneegans and Camus. Since claim 1 is believed to be allowable, dependent claim 7 is believed to be allowable as well.

In the last paragraph on page 7 of the Office action, claim 7 has been rejected as being obvious over Huang (U.S Patent Application Publication 2002/0074672 A1) in view of Camus (EP 0 701 281 A2) and further in view of Arakawa (U.S Patent No. 4,497,875) under 35 U.S.C. § 103. As noted above, the Huang reference is not available as prior art. Therefore, claim 7 is believed to be allowable.

It is accordingly believed to be clear that none of the references, whether taken alone or in any combination, either show or suggest the features of claim 1. Claim 1 is, therefore, believed to be patentable over the art and since all of the dependent claims are ultimately dependent on claim 1, they are believed to be patentable as well.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-7 are solicited.

In the event the Examiner should still find any of the claims to be unpatentable, counsel respectfully requests a telephone

Applic. No. 10/057,154
Amdt. dated November 5, 2003
Reply to Office action of August 5, 2003

call so that, if possible, patentable language can be worked out.

If an extension of time for this paper is required, petition for extension is herewith made.

Please charge any other fees which might be due with respect to Sections 1.16 and 1.17 to the Deposit Account of Lerner & Greenberg P.A., No. 12-1099.

Respectfully submitted,


For Applicant(s)

Alfred K. Dassler
52,794

AKD:cgm

November 5, 2003

Lerner and Greenberg, P.A.
Post Office Box 2480
Hollywood, FL 33022-2480
Tel: (954) 925-1100
Fax: (954) 925-1101